DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 054 770 JC 710 233

AUTHOR Wattenbarger, James L.; Sakaguchi, Melvyn

TITLE State Level Boards for Community Junior Colleges: Patterns of Control and Coordination.

INSTITUTION Florida Univ., Gainesville. Inst. of Higher Education.

PUB DATE Aug 71

NOTE 77p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29

DESCRIPTORS *Board of Education Role; Fiscal Capacity; *Junior Colleges; Master Plans; *Planning; State Aid; *State Boards of Education; *Statewide Planning

ABSTRACT

Patterns of control and coordination for community junior colleges as shown by state-level boards are reviewed. It was found that 43 states had developed a state-level agency responsible for coordinating, planning, and in some cases controlling this level of education. The study indicated a decisive trend toward state-level concern for community junior colleges. An increase in state-level planning and financial support seemed to accompany an increase in state-level control and operation. Thirteen states reported that a state board coordinates their community junior colleges; five states coordinate or administer their colleges through a university board, which is also concerned with other institutions of higher education; 14 states use the state department of education as the locus of responsibility, with usually a special staff or division in charge; and 11 states assign responsibility for community junior colleges to the same board that is responsible for all of higher education. These four categories, of course, encompass a wider variety of board responsibilities than is shown here. (AL)

ED054770

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

STATE LEVEL BOARDS FOR COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGES: PATTERNS OF CONTROL AND COORDINATION

James L. Wattenbarger

and

Melvyn Sakaguchi

Institute of Higher Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

JC 710 233

August, 1971

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

OCT 29 1971

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

A publication of the Southeastern Community College Leadership Program with the help of a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation

ED071203

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Institute of Higher Ed., Univ. of Florida, Gainesville TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Copyright, 1971

Institute of Higher Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32601

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	vi
SECTION I - OVERVIEW	1
Scope and Plan of Study	1
SECTION II - SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF BOARDS	4
Boards Responsible for Community Junior Colleges Only	5
Boards Responsible for All Institutions of Higher Education	6
Boards of State University Systems	7
Boards Responsible for All Public Educational Institutions	8
Relationship Between Size of Systems and Type of Board Maintained and Function	10
Conclusions	12
SECTION III - ACTIVITIES OF BOARDS	18
Boards Responsible for Community Junior Colleges Only	20
Boards Responsible for All Institutions of Higher Education	23
Boards of State University Systems	24
Boards Responsible for All Public Educational Institutions	26
Conclusions	28

Page

SECTION IV - TABLES 34

Table I - Distribution of State Level Boards, by Type and Number of Institutions Under Jurisdiction 35

Table II - Distribution of State Level Boards, by Function and Number of Institutions Under Jurisdiction 36

Table III - Distribution of State Level Boards, by Type and Function 37

Table IV - Distribution of State Level Boards, by Type and Terms of Board Members 38

Table V - Distribution of State Level Boards, by Type and Number of Board Members 39

Table VI - Distribution of Governing Boards by Summary Total of Responsibility Assumed by the Board for Selected Activities . 40

Table VII - Distribution of Governing-Coordinating Boards by Summary Total of Responsibility Assumed by the Board for Selected Activities 41

Table VIII - Distribution of Coordinating Boards by Summary Total of Responsibility Assumed by the Board for Selected Activities 42

SECTION V - APPENDICES 43

Appendix A - Questionnaire - Survey: State Boards Responsible for Community Junior Colleges 44

Appendix B_1 - Selected Characteristics of State Level Boards - Boards Responsible for CJC Only 48

Appendix B_2 - Selected Characteristics of State Level Boards - Boards Responsible for All Institutions of Higher Education . 50

Appendix B_3 - Selected Characteristics of State Level Boards - Boards of State University Systems 52

Appendix B_4 - Selected Characteristics of State Level Boards - Boards Responsible for All Public Educational Institutions . . 53

Page

SECTION V - APPENDICES (Continued) . . . . . .

Appendix C_1 - Activities of State Level Boards - Boards Responsible for CJC Only 55

Appendix C_2 - Activities of State Level Boards - Boards Responsible for All Institutions of Higher Education 57

Appendix C_3 - Activities of State Level Boards - Boards of State University Systems 59

Appendix C_4 - Activities of State Level Boards - Boards Responsible for All Public Educational Institutions 60

Appendix D_1 - Activities of State Level Boards - Summary - All Governing Boards 62

Appendix D_2 - Activities of State Level Boards - Summary - All Governing-Coordinating Boards 63

Appendix D_3 - Activities of State Level Boards - Summary - All Coordinating Boards 64

SECTION VI - SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 65

FOREWORD

Increasing emphasis upon state level planning accompanied by the increasing focus upon the development of community junior colleges has caused forty-three states to develop a state level agency responsible for coordination and (in some cases) control of this level of education. In most states a board has been assigned these responsibilities, either an existing board or one newly created for this purpose.

Little information has been available, however, regarding the status and responsibilities of these boards. Such information is needed as the several states attempt to analyze and to evaluate their own organization and procedures. This report is a status survey of state level boards responsible for community junior colleges. It is one of a series of similar studies carried out under the program of the Southeastern Community College Leadership Program which is partially supported by a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

The study indicates a decisive trend toward more state level concern for community junior colleges. Not only do most states now provide an emphasis upon planning at the state level but there is also noted an increasing financial support from state level sources and an accompanying increase in state level control and operation. Thirteen states report that a state board coordinates the community junior colleges in those states; five states coordinate or administer their community junior colleges through a university board which is also concerned with other institutions of higher education; fourteen states use the state

department of education as the locus of responsibility with a special staff or division in charge in most of these states; and eleven states assign responsibility for community junior colleges to the same board that is responsible for all of higher education. Even these four categories, however, encompass a variety of board responsibilities as may be seen in this report.

Mr. Melvyn Sakaguchi is a Kellogg Fellow at the University of Florida. He has served on the staff of the University of Hawaii's community colleges. We are indebted to the state directors for their cooperation in providing the information requested. We trust they will be recompensed through the information provided herein.

We are especially indebted to Dr. Louis Bender, our colleague at Florida State University, for his careful review of this study and for his worthwhile suggestions for improvement. We are also indebted to Mr. Hugh Turner, a Kellogg Fellow at the University of Florida, for his excellent review and suggestions for improvement.

Dr. Dayton Y. Roberts is to be recognized for his excellent editorial contributions to the final report.

James L. Wattenbarger, Director
Institute of Higher Education
University of Florida

August, 1971

SECTION I

OVERVIEW

Scope and Plan of Study

During the summer of 1970, questionnaires requesting information on state level boards for public community junior colleges were sent to state directors for these colleges in all fifty states and Puerto Rico. Data collected by this instrument constitute the basis for this study. Previous investigations of state level governance of these colleges undertaken by the Institute of Higher Education of the University of Florida and by the American Association of Junior Colleges were used to supplement this data.

The study focuses on two aspects of state level boards: their characteristics and their major activities. A broad framework for analysis is provided by categorizations of these boards by type and overall operational role, and characteristics are summarized and activities described within and across these categories.

Boards are grouped by type into four categories: boards responsible solely for community junior colleges; boards responsible for all public institutions of higher education in the state, including these colleges; boards of a state university system through which these colleges are administered; boards of education responsible for all public educational institutions in the state, including these colleges.

In terms of operational roles, these boards are grouped into three categories: governing boards; governing-coordinating boards; coordinating

boards. A governing board is one legally charged with the direct control and operation of community junior colleges. A coordinating board is legally charged with organizing, regulating, or otherwise bringing together overall policies or functions in areas of planning, budgeting and programming, but does not have the authority to govern. A governing-coordinating board is legally charged with responsibilities for governing and coordinating the activities of the colleges.

Thirteen states have a state board serving only community junior colleges. They are: Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Virginia, Washington and Wyoming.

A state board of higher education is responsible for public community junior colleges in eleven states: Arkansas, Georgia, New Mexico, New Jersey, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, West Virginia and Wisconsin.

A state university system board has governing or coordinating responsibility for these colleges in five states: Alaska, Hawaii, Kentucky, Nevada and New York.

Fourteen states report that the state board of education is charged with primary responsibility for public community junior colleges. These states are: Alabama, Florida, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island and Tennessee.

In five states, Indiana, Maine, New Hampshire, South Dakota and Vermont, public community junior colleges have not yet been established or are locally controlled and not under the direct operational jurisdiction

of a state level board. These states are thus not included in the study.

Nebraska and North Dakota provide for a degree of state level control over some of their public community junior colleges, through the state board of education and a board of higher education, respectively. However, reflecting the somewhat limited operational role reported for the boards and the absence of detailed information, these states are not included within this study.

Puerto Rico operates its colleges through its university system. However, it too is not included in this study because of the absence of the requisite detailed information.

The grouping of states into the various categories of types of boards, and by overall function or operational role of boards, is based on responses to the questionnaire. In a few instances, the categories designated are not mutually exclusive. Consequently a state may be viewed as properly categorized in either of two groups. Georgia and Hawaii as an example, administer their public community junior colleges through its state university system which includes all public institutions of higher education in the state. The designated board thus functions operationally as both a state university system board and a board of higher education, and the state may be viewed as belonging to either category.

SECTION II

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF BOARDS

The first portion of the study focuses on provisions for the governance or coordination of community junior colleges by a state board, and on the primary characteristics of these boards.

States are grouped by the type of board maintained and each board type is analyzed to identify common characteristics. Comparisons are made between categories of types to determine distinguishing and common features. The relationship between the number of colleges served and the type and overall function of the board is also examined to determine whether quantitative differences are reflected in the type of board established by the state.

As noted, the framework for analysis is provided by a categorizing of states by the type of board maintained. Four general patterns are found: boards responsible for only community junior colleges; boards overseeing all public institutions of higher education; state university system boards; boards of education.

Characteristics on which data were collected include types of board maintained, basis of authority, number of colleges served, the relationship of the board to other state level boards and local boards, and provisions for membership including representativeness, size of boards, length of terms of office, and method of appointment. Detailed responses to selected items,

by states, are included as Appendix B.

Boards Responsible for Community Junior Colleges Only

Thirteen states maintain a state board to oversee the activities of their public community junior colleges exclusively. These boards are a relatively new development and more than half of these have been established only within the past six years. Three of these states report having a governing board, five have a coordinating board, and five, a governing-coordinating board.

States in this category include several with larger systems. Among them are California, Illinois, Minnesota, Mississippi, Washington and Virginia; six of the twelve states in the nation with the greatest number of colleges in current operation.

Membership on these boards range from five to eighteen. Three states report a nine member board, and fifteen and seventeen member boards are maintained by two states each. Provisions for membership reflect a major emphasis on lay or non-educator control. These boards are not composed exclusively of lay members however, and nine states provide for the membership of professional educators, usually a state educational administrator. Delaware, Mississippi and Wyoming make provisions for constituent representation by providing for the appointment to the board of college representatives. California and Massachusetts extend the franchise further, by providing for a student representative. Massachusetts also makes special arrangements for the representation of women on the board, one of only two states maintaining such a provision in law.

Members of all boards except Wyoming's serve by gubernatorial appointment, generally with legislative sanction, or by ex officio provisions. None are elected to their positions by the public at large.

The modal term of office is six years, a term giving some stability to the board, as well as an opportunity for board members to acquire expertise in institutional matters. Wyoming and Delaware provide for relatively short appointments of from two to three years. The relatively large proportion of boards reporting terms of from six to seven years (eight states), a period not paralleling the usual political terms, suggests an attempt to insulate the board to an extent from political events.

Boards Responsible for All Institutions of Higher Education

State boards for higher education are less novel in American higher education than boards for community junior colleges. They are historically, however, relative newcomers. Of the eleven states reporting boards of this type, five have established them within the past six years. As might be expected because of the broadened scope of a board responsible for a variety of institutions, its most frequently reported function or operational role (eight states) is service in a coordinative capacity. Only three states, Georgia, Utah and West Virginia maintain a governing board for all higher educational institutions; those for the latter two states being recently authorized.

The number of colleges operated under each of these eleven boards is relatively small, ranging from two to fourteen colleges. Texas is the exception and its forty-six colleges skew the distribution considerably.

Board membership encompasses a wide range of from nine to eighteen,

with most of the boards grouped along the higher range. The majority of these states maintain a wholly lay board appointed by the governor, only four including professional educators, although South Carolina reserves half of its board membership for state level administrators. New Jersey provides for a representative of the private colleges in the state, over which the state board exercises some authority, as well as for three local board members to serve on the state board. Like Massachusetts, New Jersey also requires the appointment of two women board members. Wisconsin like South Carolina, arranges for institutional representation by reserving seven of seventeen seats for local board representatives and state level administrators.

Somewhat extended terms of office are established for trustees with a modal term of six years. Arkansas maintains a ten year term of office; Ohio and Oklahoma, a nine year term; Wisconsin, an eight year term.

Four states, Arkansas, South Carolina, Texas and Wisconsin, report the sharing of some coordinative responsibility with other state level boards for certain college activities. In all cases this responsibility was shared with a state board for vocational education.

Boards of State University Systems

Community junior colleges in New York, Hawaii, Kentucky, Nevada and Alaska are administered as part of a state university system, and consequently, coordinated or governed at the state level by the university board. Boards in this category serve either as a governing board (Hawaii) or one assuming a governing-coordinating operational role (four states).

These boards range in size from eight to eighteen, with no trend

evidenced, and all are dominated by lay members. However, Kentucky provides for a degree of constituent representation through provisions for faculty and student membership on its board. Nevada, unlike any of the other states in this category, elects its board members. In all of the other states, trustees are appointed by the governor. New York is also unique among the states in this group in providing for a measure of local control of the colleges under the overall jurisdiction of the state university board.

The term of office of a board member in New York is ten years, the longest of any of the states. Alaska maintains an eight year term; Kentucky, Hawaii and Nevada report four year terms.

Boards Responsible for All Public Educational Institutions

Fourteen states report the extension of authority of the state board of education over the community junior colleges. As with those states providing for boards of higher education and consequently having authority over a diversity of institutional types, most of the boards in this category adopt essentially a coordinative role. Only the states of Tennessee and Louisiana, both with a relatively small complement of colleges, maintain a governing board. Oregon and Alabama, each with a larger number of colleges, indicate a governing-coordinating role for their state level boards. Alabama assumes an operational similarity with Tennessee despite the reported differences in role. It does not provide for local boards for governing either.

The degree of decentralization of the authority of the state board, made necessary by the diverse array of institutions might suggest a situation conducive to neglect of the particular requirements of the colleges

and thus be a retarding factor in their development. The examples offered by Florida, Michigan, Kansas and North Carolina, all states with well established systems of community junior colleges, would deny such an assumption. Most of the boards in this category exercise a coordinative role and assign considerable authority and responsibility to the local boards which govern colleges themselves.

Compensating in part for the larger scope of the board, several states, among them Florida, Kansas and Michigan, have established state level college advisory boards to assist the state board of education in matters pertaining to these colleges. One could surmise that in time these states might evolve separate boards for community junior colleges as the demands upon the board of education increase and it relinquishes some of its authority and responsibility to these advisory boards. While this progression is a logical possibility, Florida recently moved in an opposite direction by establishing an advisory council to replace a separate college board.

Systems of colleges maintained by states in the category exhibit a wide range in numbers of institutions, from one to twenty-nine. Generally, the larger systems are relatively more prevalent and almost sixty-five percent of the states report eleven or more colleges under the jurisdiction of the board.

A larger proportion of states in this category than in others elect all or some board members. However, the number is not great and consists of only four states: Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan and Montana. Alabama is slated to turn in this direction in 1971.

Lay influence is strongly evidenced, with eight of the fourteen states maintaining all lay member boards. In all but one of the other states,

lay membership constitutes a majority. Michigan provides for considerable representation of professional educators, including four educator-trustees, one half of the board total, and requires that all of these members be elected by the public at large. Florida maintains another unique arrangement where by constitutional provision the governor and certain cabinet members, among whom is the commissioner of education, comprise the total membership of the state board of education.

The size of boards, in view of the broad responsibilities of the state level board, is comparatively small. The membership range is from seven to seventeen with nine states, over sixty percent of those in this category, reporting a board of ten or fewer members.

Some provisions are made for representativeness of the board through requirements for geographic representation and limitations on the number of trustees with a common political party affiliation. Iowa provides for a representative of vocational education agencies and one of its community junior colleges on its board.

Terms of office are relatively long. Five states maintain a term of eight years for their board members. Sixty-five percent of the states in the category appoint trustees for six or more years. In eight states, however, the terms of office are coincident with those of the elected executive officers of the state, raising the possibility that the boards could reflect the effects of political elections.

Relationship Between Size of Systems and Type of Board Maintained and Function

For this part of the analysis, states were grouped by the number of community junior colleges under the jurisdiction of the board. Ranges of

from 1-5, 6-10, 11-20, and 21 or more colleges were established. By far the largest number of states, forty percent, fall within the 11-20 range. Twenty-three percent are in the 1-5 range; twenty-one percent in the 6-10 range; sixteen percent report systems comprised of more than 20 colleges.

It was surmised that states with larger numbers of institutions would favor the maintenance of "special boards" such as one for community junior colleges only, or one for all institutions of higher education. This type of board would represent the result of a sequential development of state level governance wherein responsibility for community junior colleges is first delgated to a general board such as a state board of education and then is shifted to "special boards" more fully concerned with these colleges as the system evolves. Inspection of the data summarized on Table 1, however, suggests otherwise. While the number of colleges operated by a state may be a factor in the development of these "special boards" which focus on a more limited range of institutional types, there does not appear to be a very significant relationship. A trend might seem evident in the distribution of states with boards for community junior colleges only, almost half having from 11-20 colleges under its jurisdiction. However, even more of the states with these numbers of institutions (11-20) provide for state level governance of their community junior colleges through a state board of education.

One might expect a relationship between the size of the state system and the overall function or operational role of the board, with those states having many institutions favoring a coordinative role for their state level board due to the problems arising from an extended span of control. Table II shows no significant relationship, however, between function or

overall operational role of the state level board and the number of colleges under the board's jurisdiction. Almost sixty percent of the states with from one to ten colleges, and about the same proportion of those with eleven or more, report the primary function of their board as coordinative. Inspection of the data therefore suggests that while the number of institutions operated within a state system may be a factor in determining the role adopted by a state board, it does not appear to be a significant one.

Conclusions

The following conclusions can be drawn from analysis and comparison of the categorical summaries:

1. Four types of state level boards with authority over community junior colleges can be identified. They are: a board serving only these colleges; a board serving all institutions of higher education in the state; a board serving a state university system under which the colleges are operated; a board serving all public educational institutions in the state.

   The plurality of states, fourteen of forty-three, report having a state board of education with authority extending over community junior colleges. Thirteen states, thirty percent of the total, report a board charged with sole responsibility for these colleges. Eleven states report the maintenance of

a state board of higher education responsible for all public institutions of higher education, including the colleges. Five states operate their community junior colleges through the state university system, and thus delegate this responsibility to the state university board.

2. More state level boards serve in a coordinative than in a governing or a governing-coordinating capacity (Table III). More serve in a governing-coordinating than in a governing capacity. Further, the coordinative role is most favored by states with boards of higher education or boards of education. Percentagewise within categories, the governing or governing-coordinating role is most favored by boards solely responsible for community junior colleges and by university system boards. The governing role is most frequently assumed by states with from six to ten colleges; the coordinating role by those states with eleven or more colleges within the jurisdiction of the board.

3. State boards for community junior colleges are a relatively new development. Over half of these boards have been established within the past six years. State boards of higher education are also newcomers, with seven of the eleven boards in this category being established only within the past

ten years. The growth of these types of boards may suggest a trend toward such "special boards" as a means of providing state level governance or coordination of community junior colleges.

4. Systems of community junior colleges under the jurisdiction of a state board are still relatively small in size. Ninety percent of the reporting states maintain fewer than twenty institutions, and forty-five percent have systems with ten or fewer colleges.

Of the twelve states with the greatest number of colleges under their jurisdiction, half maintain a state level board serving community junior colleges only. No significant relationship is perceived, however, between the overall function or operational role of the board and the type or number of institutions for which it is responsible.

5. State level boards are heavily lay member oriented. Only a few states provide for constituent representation, but a greater number provide for the representation of professional educators, usually the state director of community junior colleges or superintendent of education. Only three states, California, Kentucky and Massachusetts, call for student membership on the board.

Geographic qualifications and restrictions on

the number of trustees with common political affiliation are the most frequently cited measures to insure representativeness. The latter limitation that of political affiliation is of significance in its implications of the political nature of the board.

Of note is the fact that the tradition of lay membership characterizing local institutional boards, is as firmly fixed on the state level. Lay membership is a positive feature in contributing a degree of objectivity to educational decision making, as well as public representation. However, it would seem that as boards assume a more coordinative role and its focus changes from direct to more indirect guidance, its composition may be more appropriately balanced in favor of constituent representation.

6. Length of terms of office of state board members range from the variable one to seven year appointments in Rhode Island to a ten year period in New York and Arkansas. The modal term is six years and there is a conspicuous trend toward fairly long service, almost seventy percent of the states having terms of from six to ten years and thus providing a degree of stability and continuity.

No significant relationship is apparent between the length of term and category of the board, i.e.

"special boards" with a limited number of institutional types under its jurisdiction, or state boards of education serving a more diverse array of institutions.

A number of states schedule terms for trustees coincident with the election cycle for state officials, either four or eight years, suggesting the possibility of political influence on educational matters. However, some measure of protection against this contingency is afforded by provisions for staggered appointments.

7. The number of persons serving on state level boards extend over a wide range of from five to eighteen members. The modal value is nine, but a considerable number of boards report memberships of fifteen and seventeen as well.

There seems to be no significant relationship between the institutional scope of the board, i.e. the number of different types of institutions under board jurisdiction, and the number of trustees provided for.

8. Most trustees are either appointed by the governor of the state, usually with legislative consent, or serve ex officio. Wyoming, which maintains a coordinating board for community junior colleges, provides by statute for the appointment

of all state level board members. The relatively few boards with members elected by the public are primarily those serving as state boards of education.

Overall, comparisons of characteristics of the several types of state level boards responsible for community junior colleges do not reveal features which serve to distinguish one type of board from another. Variations are plentiful within each category, and while common characteristics can be identified, their frequency is not sufficiently high to permit generalizations on differences.

Certain trends anticipated as reflecting a logical evolution of types and functions of boards are not evident. Thus, while one could surmise that "special boards", such as the state boards for higher education or for community junior colleges only, would emerge as the number of colleges increased, no supportive evidence is noted. Likewise, the hypothesis that boards with responsibility over a variety of institutional types would have a broader membership or a significantly greater degree of continuity, so as to deal with the increased complexity, is not found to be supportable. Institutional autonomy, as reflected by the assumption of the board of a coordinative rather than a governing posture would also seem to be related to the number of institutions under board jurisdiction. Analysis suggests, however, that the conclusions hypothesized are not supportable.

The conclusion drawn from this examination is that patterns of governance, as reflected by provisions for state level boards, do not seem to evolve from a consideration of the changing requirements of the institutions.

SECTION III

ACTIVITIES OF BOARDS

This portion of the study focuses on the actual activities undertaken by the state level board. Descriptive summaries are compiled of board activities within each category type, and within groupings by overall function or operational role. Comparisons are made across categories to identify activities undertaken which might differentiate the boards.

The analysis is based on the role of the board with respect to twenty activities or functions. Three categories of responses were suggested by the questionnaire:

1. that the board plays a primary role in assuming responsibility for planning, initiating, or developing the policy or activity;
2. that the board plays a lesser role, approving or reviewing key decisions relating to the activities, with the primary responsibility for initiating, planning, and developing assumed by the colleges;
3. that the board plays no role in operational decision making, with full responsibility and authority assumed by the colleges.

Two other types of responses were frequently included by respondents:

1. that authority or responsibility for a particular activity is shared with some other state level agency, or with the colleges, to the degree that both are equal partners;
2. that decision making relative to the activity is exercised by the legislature and is discharged by way of statutory provisions.

The activities listed on the questionnaire are by no means an exhaustive compilation of operational responsibilities but they include some of the principal items of concern, relating to the development and maintenance of an educational institution. Generally, these activities can be divided into two groups.

The first encompasses those functions which may be more logically undertaken by a state level agency because of requirements for uniformity, efficiency or the objectivity provided by an extra-institutional agency. It includes the specific functions of establishing criteria and standards for the creation of new colleges, evaluating institutions, formulating budget recommendations to the governor and state legislature on state funding, allocating and/or reallocating state funds, serving as legislative spokesman for the colleges, and developing a master plan for facility and program requirements.

The second grouping consists of those activities generally assumed by an institution and incorporates activities related to the establishment of new service and educational programs, applications for federal aid, admission regulations, tuition and fee schedules, probation and suspension policies, grading policies, articulation agreements, formulation of a

salary schedule for professional employees, tenure and promotion policies, award of tenure and promotions, award and termination of appointments, and preparation of an institutional budget.

Again it should be noted that the listings are by no means absolute and that there are borderline activities, i.e. those which are shared by both a central agency and the institution in equal or varying degrees. However, within broad limitations these groupings have a reasonable amount of validity and so are used to provide a framework for the analysis undertaken.

Boards Responsible for Community Junior Colleges Only

Three of the thirteen states with boards in this category, Connecticut, Delaware and Minnesota report having a governing board. Five states including Arizona, Colorado, Massachusetts, Virginia and Washington maintain a governing-coordinating board. Coordinating boards are reported by the remaining five states: California, Illinois, Maryland, Mississippi and Wyoming.

The governing boards are described as having the primary responsibility for planning and developing the requisite policies and activities in essentially all of the areas examined, suggesting that a relatively centralized system of community junior colleges is maintained in these states.

Considerable diversity is observed in the assumption of particular responsibilities by boards perceived as having a governing-coordinating function. Activities in which the board assumes a primary role are more limited. They include developing state master plans outlining facility

and program requirements, developing criteria and standards for the establishment of new colleges, providing budget recommendations to the governor and the legislature, serving as the agency primarily concerned with the allocation or reallocation of state funds following legislative appropriations, establishing tuition fees, and acting as legislative spokesman for the colleges. More or less secondary roles are taken in the development of federal aid applications, new educational programs at the colleges, and probation and suspension policies. Those areas most frequently reserved for the colleges include the development of grading policies, the award of promotions and tenure, and the award and termination of appointments. A wide diversity is observable in practices connected with articulation agreements, professional salary schedules, and the establishment of new service programs, e.g. community services, counseling.

Coordinating boards likewise show considerable diversity of practice. A majority of boards assume primary responsibility in only three areas: developing budget recommendations, allocating/reallocating legislative appropriations, and establishing criteria for new colleges. Board approval is frequently reported requisite in the development of state master plans and in the establishment of new colleges and educational programs. Those areas in which the board exercises only a minimal role include the development of applications for federal aid, admission regulations, tuition charges, probation/suspension policies, grading policies, salary schedules, tenure and promotion policies, the award of tenure, promotions and appointments and dismissals. Only two state boards, Illinois and Wyoming, report any responsibility for evaluating colleges within their jurisdiction. California cites the role of the accrediting agency in this regard. Likewise,

three states of a total of five take responsibility for articulation agreements. Legislative or statutory provisions are noted by one state, Wyoming, as being the means by which criteria for establishing new colleges are derived. Admission regulations and tuition fees are established by law for one state board, California.

The boards in this category assume in common only those activities relating to the formulation of budgeting recommendations and the allocation and reallocation of legislative appropriations. Policies relating to grading, award of tenure, appointments and promotions are generally delegated to the colleges by the governing-coordinating and coordinating boards, but are reserved by governing boards. A lesser role as approving agency is maintained in common by governing-coordinating and coordinating boards in matters relating to the development of facility and program master plans, and the establishment of new educational programs.

Overall, governing boards are distinguished from the others in this category by their primary role in the activities listed. Differentiation between governing-coordinating and coordinating boards is more difficult and is centered about the degree of institutional responsibility for grading policies, establishing salary schedules, tenure and promotion policies, and the award of tenure, promotions and appointments. One activity in which there is a marked difference in orientation of these boards is that of establishing a probation/suspension policy. Governing-coordinating boards report having some responsibility for this function, while coordinating boards generally provide for institutional autonomy, leaving the matter for the colleges under their jurisdiction.

Boards Responsible for All Institutions of Higher Education

Three of the eleven state boards in this category, Georgia, Utah and West Virginia, are reported as serving primarily in the capacity of a governing agency. The remaining eight are described as coordinating boards and they include Arkansas, New Jersey, New Mexico, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Texas and Wisconsin.

The three governing boards assume a primary role in nearly all of the activities described previously as being logically within the purview of a state level agency. These include the development of master plans for facilities, new college criteria, the establishment of new colleges, evaluation, consolidation of institutional budgets and formulation of budget recommendations, allocating state funds, and acting as legislative spokesman for the colleges. The establishment of a tuition rate and the initiation of articulation agreements are two other functions reserved primarily for the board or its administrative agency. A considerably lesser role, that of serving as an approving agency, is reserved by the board for all other activities on which the states were polled.

The coordinating boards maintained by the eight states in the category assume in common primary responsibility in only three activity areas. These consist of the development of criteria for establishing new institutions, and those relating to state support: preparation of budget recommendations for the governor and legislature, and the allocation of appropriated funds. The boards are reported as having a lesser degree of responsibility for review and approval of facility and program masterplans, the establishment of new colleges, institutional budgets, and tuition/fee schedules. The development of probation and suspension policies, tenure

rules, and the award of tenure, promotions and appointments are college functions in almost all instances. Responsibility for new educational and service programs and for admission regulations is reported by about half of the boards as being assumed by the colleges. The other half of these coordinating boards retain a minimal role of approval or review on these activities, particularly the first two. Four states, Arkansas, Ohio, South Carolina and Texas describe evaluation as an institutional responsibility; the others assume some responsibility for this function.

A clear distinction can be drawn between the governing and the coordinating boards. The distinguishing feature of the latter is the extension of institutional control over a number of areas, particularly those described previously as institutional activities. Coordinating boards in this category also distinguish themselves by assuming a larger role as approver or reviewer of institutional policy and activity, even in those areas viewed as usually within the purview of a central agency. Three functions are shared in common, however, by both governing and coordinating boards: the two functions relating to state funding, and that dealing with the development of criteria for new institutions.

Boards of State University Systems

Five states, Alaska, Hawaii, Kentucky, Nevada and New York comprise this category. One of these, Hawaii, maintains a governing board and the four other state boards serve as governing-coordinating agencies.

Unlike governing boards in the two previous categories, Hawaii's state level board is described as exercising little of its governing authority and as assuming principally a role as approver and reviewer of institutional

policy and activity. Two functions, the establishing of probation/suspension policies and grading regulations are delegated totally to the colleges. The board plays a primary role in establishing new colleges, fixing tuition and salary schedules, preparing budget recommendations for state funding and allocating legislative appropriations.

The four state boards assuming a governing-coordinating posture, are more directly involved in the listed responsibilities than the one governing board in this category. Those activities generally regarded as board oriented, relating to the development of criteria for and the establishing of new colleges, evaluation, all functions pertaining to state funding, and service as principal legislative spokesman, are almost unanimously maintained in common by these boards. In addition, most of these boards reserve for themselves a primary role with respect to institutional budgets, tenure and promotion policies, and the award of tenure, promotions, and appointments. Half of the boards assume primary responsibility for institutional master planning, determination of admission policy, tuition schedules, probation/suspension and grading policies, and inter-institutional articulation. Half also retain approval or review authority over applications for federal funds and the establishment of new programs. No activity or function is delegated to institutions completely by a majority of the boards.

Overall, it may be concluded that boards in this category generally assume a dominant role with respect to the designated activities and functions. Governing-coordinating boards distinguish themselves from the governing board in this category by the assertion of more rather than less authority and responsibility.

Boards Responsible for All Public Educational Institutions

Two of the fourteen states in this category, Louisiana and Tennessee, maintain governing boards. Two others, Alabama and Oregon, report governing-coordinating boards. Ten states including Florida, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island maintain purely coordinative boards.

The two governing boards assume responsibility for planning and initiating policies and programs in most of the areas listed. One state reports an approving or reviewing role on matters relating to state funding, institutional budgets, new programs, applications for federal assistance, grading policies and award of tenure, promotions and appointments. Neither of these boards delegate full responsibility for any activity to the colleges under their jurisdiction.

Both governing-coordinating boards reserve for themselves a primary role with respect to most of the state agency designated activities. One of them, Oregon, maintains a more moderate posture by assuming an approving/reviewing role in master planning, establishing new colleges, evaluation, and formulation of institutional budgets. Two activities, those relating to federal projects and the award and termination of appointments, are allocated to the colleges. A divergence is manifested in most of the institutional oriented activities, with one state board being directly involved in almost all of the activities cited, with the exceptions noted previously, and the other board engaged to the extent of overseeing institutional responsibilities.

Most of the states in this category declare a coordinating role for their board, and the relatively large number of these boards contributes to some

degree to the diversity shown. Like coordinating boards in the other categories, the majority of these assume primary responsibility for criteria for new colleges, allocation and reallocation of state funds, and the evaluation of institutions. Half report the formulation of budget recommendations for use by the governor and legislature; slightly less assume primary responsibility for developing facility and program master plans. Most of these boards have no major part in the determination of probation/suspension policies, grading regulations, professional salary schedules, policies relating to tenure and promotion, and the granting of tenure, promotions and appointments, as well as the termination of appointments.

There is a considerable degree of diversity manifested on the matter of admission regulations. Three state boards, Idaho, Montana and Pennsylvania, assume an approver/reviewer posture; one, North Carolina, retains primary responsibility; and three, including Florida, Kansas and Michigan leave the matter to the colleges. A similar situation exists with respect to articulation agreements, half of the boards playing no role, three participating indirectly, and one assuming full responsibility.

A majority of the state coordinating boards report the possession of authority to review or approve the establishment of new colleges, the development of new programs, and applications for federal assistance. Four of these boards do not serve as principal legislative spokesman for their colleges, an activity which could be logically considered the perogative of a central agency. Responses to the latter item showed a marked variation, with three boards, those of Florida, Kansas and Rhode Island, claiming primary or secondary responsibility, and one, Idaho, reporting that the function is shared.

Conclusions

Reviewing the summaries and generalizing on the basis of broad comparisons across groupings by type of board and overall function, several conclusions regarding the activities of state level boards can be drawn. Among them are the following:

1. Almost all state boards exercising authority over community junior colleges have specific activities in common, despite divergencies in overall function or operational posture. These activities include the preparation of recommendations on state funding, service as the allocating agency for these state funds, and the development of criteria and requirements for new institutions. Since an overwhelming majority of boards exercise responsibilities at a primary level of participation, it may be concluded that these activities are essential and typical functions of all state level boards.

2. Governing, governing-coordinating and coordinating boards are to a discernible degree characterized by their assumption of degrees of responsibility with respect to particular activities. Consequently, these boards can be said to differ from each other by the assumption or delegation of certain responsibilities. The differences, while obviously not absolute and derived on the basis of gross comparisons, suggest that responsi-

bilities, as well as the manner they are discharged, distinguish each type of board.

3. Governing boards are particularly distinguished by the primary or secondary roles assumed with regard to all of the activities investigated. That is, the vast majority of these boards either initiate policy or programs in most of the areas examined or serve as an approving or reviewing agency. There are no activities or areas in which the colleges are provided complete autonomy over, by a majority of governing boards.

Near unanimity is displayed in the adoption of the board of a primary role as initiator or planner in those functions usually undertaken by a central agency. More variation is exhibited with respect to institutional activities, with more than half of the boards assuming a major responsibility for new educational and service programs, federal projects, salary schedules, tenure and promotion policies, and admission regulations. State board establishment of tuition schedules and articulation agreements are favored by a majority of these boards, suggesting a perceived need for uniformity in these areas. Only about a third, however, assume a primary role or control probation/ suspension and grading policies, and staff appointments.

State boards of higher education show some divergency from the governing board norm by assuming secondary rather than primary roles in those areas broadly considered within the domain of the colleges. The one state university governing board also departs from the governing board norm by its softer stance with regard to most of the activities examined. These two categories, however,comprise less than a majority of the total number of governing boards, and consequently do not appreciably affect the general pattern of the highly centralized governing board.

4. Governing-coordinating boards differ from governing boards in that more of them allow institutional autonomy over selected activities, mainly the introduction of new courses and service programs, grading policies, articulation agreements, staff salary schedules, and the award of tenure, promotion and appointments. It should be noted, however, that in none of these functions is full institutional discretion permitted by a majority of the boards.

Key activities on which governing-coordinating boards reflect dominance are three: establishing criteria for new colleges, developing legislative budget recommendations, and serving as a state

fund allocating agency. While more than half of the boards retain primary responsibility in all but one of the remaining areas, i.e. serving as legislative spokesman for the colleges, they constitute a bare majority only.

A dichotomy is apparent therefore in boards comprising this category, with some leaning toward the governing side and keeping more control, and the rest tending toward less centralization and more institutional autonomy. By categories, the greatest number of the slightly less centralized boards is found among those boards solely responsible for community junior colleges.

5. Coordinating boards distinguish themselves conspicuously by their inclination to delegate authority over a considerable number of activities to the colleges. Only in three functions is a tendency exhibited to retain primary authority and responsibility. These are the same three favored by governing-coordinating boards: those relating to new college criteria, budget recommendations, and allocation of state funds. A majority of these boards also indicates a willingness to retain authority over institutional evaluation. Few boards assume a primary role with respect to any of the other functions.

Service as an approving agency, however, is manifested by the boards particularly with respect to new programs, the establishment of new colleges, and formulation of institutional budgets and tuition schedules. Almost all of these boards give the college full authority over matters relating to probation/suspension policies, grading practices, tenure and promotion policies, salary schedules, and the award of tenure, promotions and appointments. This latter orientation serves to distinguish the coordinating board from governing and governing-coordinating boards.

Some divergence is evident between types of coordinating boards. Overall, boards of higher education and boards for only community junior colleges provide for a greater degree of institutional autonomy over college oriented activities and functions than state boards of education with responsibility over these colleges.

Depite a great deal of variation in patterns of operational authority and responsibility of the state level board for community junior colleges, there are distinguishable features which characterize each type of board. Governing, governing-coordinating, and coordinating boards differ to a degree in the type of activities and functions assumed and the extent to which these boards participate in decision making and implementation of

these. The differences provide a basis for the establishment of operational definitions of each of these types of boards.

Section IV

Tables

TABLE I

Distribution of State Level Boards, by Type and Number of Institutions Under Jurisdiction

Type of Board	Number of Institutions								Total
	1-5		6-10		11-20		21+		
Board for CJC only	1	(10)	3	(33)	6	(35)	3	(43)	13
Board of Higher Education	4	(40)	3	(33)	3	(18)	1	(14)	11
University System Board	1	(10)	2	(23)	1	(6)	1	(14)	5
Board of Education	4	(40)	1	(11)	7	(41)	2	(29)	14
Total	10	(100)	9	(100)	17	(100)	7	(100)	43

( ) vertical percentages, i.e. percent of state boards in the same range by number of institutions.

TABLE II

Distribution of State Level Boards, by Function and Number of Institutions Under Jurisdiction

Function of Board	Number of Institutions								Total
	1-5		6-10		11-20		21+		
Governing	1	(10)	4	(45)	2	(12)	0	(0)	7
Governing-Coordinating	1	(10)	2	(22)	5	(30)	2	(29)	10
Coordinating	8	(80)	3	(33)	10	(58)	5	(71)	26
Total	10	(100)	9	(100)	17	(100)	7	(100)	43

( ) vertical percentages, i.e. percent of state boards in the same range by number of institutions.

TABLE III

Distribution of State Level Boards, by Type and Function

Type of Board	Functions			Total
	Governing	Governing-Coordinating	Coordinating	
Board for CJC only	3	5	5	13
Board of Higher Education	3	0	8	11
University System Board	1	4	0	5
Board of Education	1	3	10	14
Total	8	12	23	43

TABLE IV

Distribution of State Level Boards, by Type and Terms of Board Members

Type of Board	Terms of Office (in years)					Total
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	
Board for CJC only	1	4	5[a]	3	0	13
Board of Higher Education	0	1	5	2	3	11
University System Board	0	3	0	1	1	5
Board of Education	0	3	3	7[b]	1	14
Total	1	11	13	13	5	43

a includes 1 state w/provisions for varying terms, maximum - 6 years

b includes 2 states w/provisions for varying terms, maximum - 2 and 8 years

TABLE V

Distribution of State Level Boards, by Type and Number of Board Members

Type of Board	Number of Board Members				Total
	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	
Board for CJC only	1	6	3	3	13
Board of Higher Education	0	4	4	3	11
University System Board	0	2	2	1	5
Board of Education	0	9	4	1	14
Total	1	21	13	8	43

TABLE VI

Distribution of Governing Boards by Summary Total of Responsibility Assumed by the Board for Selected Activities*

Level of Responsibility Assumed	Activities Primarily Perceived as State Agency Responsibility[a]	Activities Primarily Perceived as Institutional Responsibility[b]
% of Boards Assuming Primary Responsibility, Summary Total	89%	60%
% of Boards Assuming Secondary Responsibility, Summary Total	8%	33%
% of Boards Assuming Shared Responsibility, Summary Total	0%	0%
% of Boards Assuming No Responsibility, Summary Total	0%	3%
% of Boards For Which There was No Response	3%	4%
Total	100%	100%

a Activities primarily perceived as State Agency Responsibility: establishing criteria and standards governing establishment of new colleges; establishing new colleges; evaluating colleges; formulating budget recommendations to the governor/legislature for state funding; allocating/reallocating state funds; serving as legislative spokesman for the colleges; developing facility and program master plan.

b Activities primarily perceived as Institutional Responsibility: establishing new service and educational programs; applying for federal aid; formulating admission regulations; tuition and fee schedules; probation and suspension policies; grading policies; articulation agreements; formulation of a professional salary schedule; tenure and promotion policies; the awarding of tenure, promotion and appointments and dismissals; formulating an institutional budget.

* For details by state, please see Appendix C

TABLE VII

Distribution of Governing-Coordinating Boards by Summary Total of Responsibility Assumed by the Board for Selected Activities*

Level of Responsibility Assumed	Activities Primarily Perceived as State Agency Responsibility[a]	Activities Primarily Perceived as Institutional Responsibility[b]
% of Boards Assuming Primary Responsibility, Summary Total	75%	35%
% of Boards Assuming Secondary Responsibility, Summary Total	12%	30%
% of Boards Assuming Shared Responsibility, Summary Total	4%	8%
% of Boards Assuming No Responsibility Summary Total	0%	22%
% of Boards for Which There was No Response	9%	5%
Total	100%	100%

a Activities primarily perceived as State Agency Responsibility: establishing criteria and standards governing establishment of new colleges; establishing new colleges; evaluating colleges; formulating budget recommendations to the governor/legislature for state funding; allocating/reallocating state funds; serving as legislative spokesman for the colleges; developing facility and program master plan.

b Activities primarily perceived as Institutional Responsibility: establishing new service and educational programs; applying for federal aid; formulating admission regulations; tuition and fee schedules; probation and suspension policies; grading policies; articulation agreements; formulation of a professional salary schedule; tenure and promotion policies; the awarding of tenure, promotion and appointments and dismissals; formulating an institutional budget.

* For details by state, please see Appendix C

TABLE VIII

Distribution of Coordinating Boards by Summary Total of Responsibility Assumed by the Board for Selected Activities*

Level of Responsibility Assumed	Activities Primarily Perceived as State Agency Responsibility[a]	Activities Primarily Perceived as Institutional Responsibility[b]
% of Boards Assuming Primary Responsibility, Summary Total	51%	7%
% of Boards Assuming Secondary Responsibility, Summary Total	27%	27%
% of Boards Assuming Shared Responsibility, Summary Total	4%	3%
% of Boards Assuming No Responsibility, Summary Total	11%	57%
% of Boards For Which There was No Response	7%	6%
Total	100%	100%

a Activities primarily perceived as State Agency Responsibility: establishing criteria and standards governing establishment of new colleges; establishing new colleges; evaluating colleges; formulating budget recommendations to the governor/legislature for state funding; allocating/reallocating state funds; serving as legislative spokesman for the colleges; developing facility and program master plan.

b Activities primarily perceived as Institutional Responsibility: establishing new service and educational programs; applying for federal aid; formulating admission regulations; tuition and fee schedules; probation and suspension policies; grading policies; articulation agreements; formulation of a professional salary schedule; tenure and promotion policies; the awarding of tenure, promotion and appointments and dismissals; formulating an institutional budget.

* For details by state, please see Appendix C

Section V

Appendices

Appendix A

Southeast Junior College Leadership Center
INSTITUTE OF HIGHER EDUCATION
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32601

State_____

Respondent_____

Title_____

Address_____

SURVEY: STATE BOARDS RESPONSIBLE FOR COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGES

1. Is there a state board with responsibility for governing and/or coordinating the public community junior colleges in your state?

____ a. Yes
____ b. No

If yes, what is the name of the board?_____
When was the board established?_____

2. Institutions under the jurisdiction of this state board include:

____ a. All public community junior colleges only.
____ b. All public institutions of higher education.
____ c. All public educational institutions, including elementary, secondary, higher education institutions.
____ d. The state university, with subsequent responsibility for community colleges administered under its aegis.
____ e. Other responsibilities, please describe:
_____

3. In what overall capacity does the state board serve, as provided by Constitutional provision, statutory provision or regulation?

____ a. A governing board, legally charged with the direct control and operation of the colleges.
____ b. A coordinating board, legally charged with organizing, regulating, or otherwise bringing together overall policies or functions in areas of planning, budgeting and programming, but which does not have the authority to govern.
____ c. A governing-coordinating board, legally charged with responsibilities in both governing and coordinating the colleges as delineated in a and b.

If the state board is established as a governing board, does it in practice function as a governing board?

____ a. Yes
____ b. No

4. What is the basis of authority for the state board?

____ a. Statutory provision
____ b. Constitutional provision
____ c. Higher board, agency or departmental regulation
____ d. Voluntary membership

5. How many community junior colleges are under state board jurisdiction? (Please specify number)

_____ Fall, 1970
_____ Fall, 1971 (projected)
_____ Fall, 1975 (projected)

6. What is the relationship of the state board to other state educational boards?

	Board of Higher Ed.	Board of Education	Board for Voc. Ed.
a. Same board as the	____	____	____
b. Subordinate to	____	____	____
c. Same level of responsibility as	____	____	____

7. What is the relation of this state board to local college boards? (Please check all applicable.)

____ a. There are no local college boards
____ b. Local board is advisory only to the state board
____ c. Local board is institutional governing board
____ d. Local board appointments must be approved by state board
____ e. Local board policies must be approved by state board

8. How many state board members are provided for? (Please specify number)

_____

9. What is the composition of the state board by the following categories? (Please specify number)

Number
_____ a. Laymen (non-educators)
_____ b. Educational administrators (state level)
_____ c. Educational administrators (college representatives)
_____ d. Faculty (college representatives)
_____ e. Students (college representatives)
_____ f. Local board members (college representatives)

10. How are state board members appointed or selected: (Please specify number)

Number	
_____	a. Appointment by governor/legislative approval
_____	b. Appointment by superintendent (commissioner) of education
_____	c. Elected by public
_____	d. College representatives selected by colleges
_____	e. Ex officio provisions (Please identify by title or position, individual so appointed)_____
_____	f. Other means, please identify_____

11. How long a term of office do state board members serve?_____years
If there is a maximum number of consecutive terms that a member may serve, please specify number._____

12. What formal provisions (statutory or regulatory) are made for representativeness of the state board?

_____	a. None
_____	b. Geographic
_____	c. Social groups (minorities, disadvantaged, etc.)
_____	d. Occupational groups (management, labor unions, etc.)
_____	e. Educators (constituent representation)
_____	f. Students (constituent representation)
_____	g. Laymen (non-educators)
_____	h. Other, please identify_____

13. What are some specific activities of the state board? (Please check one category for each item.)

	State Board has primary responsibility to initiate plan for or develop	Inst.-local board has primary responsibility. State Board approves or reviews	Inst.-local board has primary responsibility. State Board plays no role
a. Program/facility master plan	_____	_____	_____
b. Criteria/standards for establishing new colleges	_____	_____	_____
c. Establishment of new college/campus	_____	_____	_____
d. Evaluation of colleges	_____	_____	_____
e. Institutional budgets (operating and facilities)	_____	_____	_____
f. Budget recommendations to governor/legislature	_____	_____	_____
g. Allocation/reallocation of state funds	_____	_____	_____
h. Sole spokesman for colleges regarding legislative matters	_____	_____	_____

	State Board has primary responsibility to initiate plan for or develop	Inst.-local board has primary responsibility. State Board approves or reviews	Inst.-local board has primary responsibility. State Board plays no role
i. New service programs (counseling, community services)	_____	_____	_____
j. New courses	_____	_____	_____
k. Federal project applications	_____	_____	_____
l. Admission regulations	_____	_____	_____
m. Tuition/fee charges	_____	_____	_____
n. Probation/suspension policies	_____	_____	_____
o. Grading policies	_____	_____	_____
p. Articulation agreements with four-year institutions	_____	_____	_____
q. Professional salary schedules	_____	_____	_____
r. Tenure/promotion policies	_____	_____	_____
s. Award of tenure/promotion	_____	_____	_____
t. Award/terminate appointments	_____	_____	_____

PLEASE:

1. Enclose, if available, a copy of law and/or regulations which establish your state board.

2. Enclose, if available, any printed or mineographed materials relating to your state board, its composition, its operation, etc.

3. Your suggestions for other information.

4. In addition to the State Board described herein, is there another state level board which is especially established to advise on matters relative to community junior colleges?

   _____ a. Yes
   _____ b. No

   If yes, what is the name of the board?_____

Appendix B_1

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF STATE LEVEL BOARDS

Boards Responsible for CJC Only

	date board established	overall function of board	number of colleges under jurisdiction	number of board members	composition of board, by categories	method of appointment	term of office	provisions for representativeness on board	other board advising re cjc matters
Arizona	1961	GC	11	17	Laymen 14 St. Ed. Admin. 3	Gov. 14 Ex Officio 3	7	none	none
California	1968	C	92	15	Laymen[a]	Gov.	4	7 must have local bd. exp. 1 student	Coord. Council Higher Education
Colorado	1967	GC	6	9	Laymen 7 St. Ed. Admin. 2	Gov.	7	Occupational Geographic Pol. party affil.	none
Connecticut	1965	G	10	12	Laymen 7 St. Ed. Admin. 5	Gov.	6	none	none
Delaware	1966	G	1	7	Laymen 5 College Rep. 2	Gov.	3	Geographic No more than 4 from same party	none
Illinois	1965	C	37	9	Laymen 8 St. Ed. Admin. 1	Gov. 8 Ex Officio 1	6	none	none
Maryland	1969	C	14	7	Laymen 6 St. Ed. Admin. 1	Gov. 6 Ex Officio 1	6	none	Maryland Council for Higher Education
Massachusetts	1958	GC	13	17	Laymen[a] 12 St. Bd. Admin. 5	Gov. 11 Ex Officio 5	6	2 must be women 1 from pvt. coll. 1 student	none

a 1 Student Representative

Appendix B_1

	date board established	overall function of board	number of colleges under jurisdiction	number of board members	composition of board, by categories	method of appointment	term of office	provisions for representativeness on board	other board advising re cjc matters
Minnesota	1963	G	18	5	Laymen	Gov.	7	none	none
Mississippi	1962	C	16	9	Laymen 3 St. Ed. Admin. 3 Coll. Admin. 3	Gov. 3 Ex Officio 3 El. by Coll. 3	6* 3	none	none
Virginia	not avl.	GC	16	15	Laymen	Gov.	4	none	none
Washington	1967	GC	26	7	Laymen	Gov.	4	Georgraphic	St. Coord. Board Council for Voc. Ed. Higher Ed. Council
Wyoming	1951	C	7	18	Laymen 8[b] St. Ed. Admin. 1 Coll. Admin. 9[c]	Ex Officio 11 Coll. Rep. 7	2	Geographic 2 from U. of W.	none

b includes 1 trustee - University of Wyoming

c includes 2 administrative representatives from University of Wyoming

*6 for laymen
3 for college representative

Appendix B_2

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF STATE LEVEL BOARDS

Boards Responsible for All Institutions of Higher Education

	date board established	overall function of board	number of colleges under jurisdiction	number of board members	composition of board, by categories	method of appointment	term of office	provisions for representativeness on board	other board advising re cjc matters
Arkansas	1961	C	2	10	Laymen	Gov.	10	No more than 3 alumni of same institution**	State Board Vocational Ed.
Georgia	1931	G	11	15	Laymen	Gov.	7	Geographic	none
New Mexico	1952	C	8	11	Laymen	Gov.	6	Geographic No more than 6 from same p. pty.	none
New Jersey	1967	C	14	17	Laymen 9 St. Ed. Admin. 2 Other* 4	Gov. 9 Ex Officio 5 Pvt. Coll. 1	6	Two lay members must be women	none
Ohio	1963	C	4	9	Laymen	Gov.	9	No inst. admin.	none
Oklahoma	1941	C	13	9	Laymen	Gov.	9	Same prof.limit4 3 from same col. 3 same con. dist.	none
South Carolina	1967	C	9	14	Laymen 7 St. Ed. Admin. 7	Gov. 7 Ex Officio 7	4	none	Tech. Education Commission
Texas	1965	C	46	18	Laymen	Gov.	6	none	State Board Vocational Ed.

a 2 Members are Non-voting

*Representative local boards 3
Representative of private college 1

**No inst. representative
No more than 2 from same Congressional District

Appendix B_2

	date board established	overall function of board	number of colleges under jurisdiction	number of board members	composition of board, by categories	method of appointment	term of office	provisions for representativeness on board	other board advising re cjc matters
Utah	1969	G	3[b]	15	Laymen	Gov.	6	none	none
West Virginia	1969	G	6	10	Laymen 9 St. Ed. Admin. 1	Gov. 9 Ex Officio 1	6	Geographic Pol. affil. lim.	none
Wisconsin	1955	C	3[c]	17	Laymen 9 St. Ed. Admin. 1 Rep. Lcl. Bd. 7	Gov. 10 Ex Officio 4 Sel. by col. 3	8	none	St. Board, Vocational, Tech., Adult Education

[b] does not include 2 tech. institutes

[c] directly coordinated by State Board of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education, but subject also to the coordinating authority of the Wisconsin Coordinating Council for Higher Education

Appendix B_3

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF STATE LEVEL BOARDS

Boards of State University Systems

	overall function of board	number of colleges under jurisdiction	number of board members	composition of board, by categories	method of appointment	term of office	kinds of provisions for representativeness on board	other board advising re cjc matters
Alaska	GC	8	8	Laymen	Gov.	8	Citizen of U. S. Res. of State	none
Hawaii	G	6	9	Laymen	Gov.	4	Geographic Alumni	none
Kentucky	GC	12[a]	18	Laymen 14[b] St. Ed. Admin. 2 Rep. Faculty 2	Gov.	4	Occupational Constituent Rep.	none
Nevada	GC	1	11	Laymen	Elected	4	Geographic	none
New York	GC	37	15	Laymen	Gov.	10	none	none
Puerto Rico								

a does not include 2 tech. institutions
b includes 1 student
c does not include 6 tech. colleges

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF STATE LEVEL BOARDS

Boards Responsible for All Public Educational Institutions

	overall function of board	number of colleges under jurisdiction	number of board members	composition of board. by categories	method of appointment	term of office	kinds of provisions for representativeness on board	other board advising re cjc matters
Alabama	GC	17[a]	10	Laymen 9[b] St. Ed. Admin. 1	Gov. 8 Ex Officio 2	4	Geographic	none
Florida	C	27	7	Laymen 6 St. Ed. Admin. 1	Ex Officio	4	none	Junior College Advisory Board
Idaho	C	2	9	Laymen 7 St. Ed. Admin. 1 Coll. Admin. 1	Gov.	5	none	none
Iowa	C	11	9	Laymen 7 Ed. Rep. 2	Gov.	6	Voc. Ed. Rep. 1 Rep. C. C. 1	none
Kansas	C	19	10	Laymen	Elected	4	Geographic	Advisory Council for CJC
Louisiana	G	2	11	Laymen	Elected	8* 3	Geographic	LSU Board of Supervisor
Michigan	C	29	8	Laymen 4 Rep. Ed. Admin. 1 Rep. Faculty 3	Elected	8	none	State Board for Public CJC (Advisory)
Missouri	C	12	8	Laymen	Gov.	8	No more than 4 from same party	Commission for Higher Education

a does not include 26 tech. colleges *8 for 8 - 3 for 3
b includes governor

Appendix B_4

	overall function of board	number of colleges under jurisdiction	number of board members	composition of board, by categories	method of appointment	term of office	kinds of provisions for representativeness on board	other board advising re cjc matters
Montana	C	3	11	Laymen 10 St. Ed. Admin. 1	Gov. 8 Elected 3	8	Geographic No more than 4 from same pol.pty.	none
North Carolina	C	15[c]	13	Laymen 12 St. Ed. Admin. 1	Gov. 10 Ex Officio 3	8	Geographic	none
Oregon	GC	12	7	Laymen	Gov.	7	Geographic	none
Pennsylvania	C	13	17	Laymen 15 Ed. Rep. 2	Gov.	6	2 must be prof. ed.	none
Rhode Island	C	1	9	Laymen 14 Rep. Col. Ad. 2 Basic Ed. 1	Gov.	var 1-7	2 must be prof. ed. none	none
Tennessee	G	6	15	Laymen 15[d]	Gov. 12	9	Geographic	none

[c] does not include 39 tech. institutions
[d] includes gov. and 2 cabinet members

Appendix C_1

ACTIVITIES OF STATE LEVEL BOARDS

Boards Responsible for CJC Only

	New colleges-criteria/standards	Budget recommendations-gov/leg	Allocation/realloc-state funds	Establishment of new college	Evaluation of colleges	Program/facility master plan	Sole spokesman legislative matters	Institutional budgets	Articulation agreements	Federal project applications	Admission regulations	Tuition/fee charges	Tenure/promotion policies	Professional salary schedules	New service programs-comm services	New courses	Grading policies	Probation/suspension policies	Award of tenure/promotion	Award/terminate appointments
Governing - Connecticut	P	P	P	P	P	P	-	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	-	-	P	P
Delaware	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Minnesota	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Governing-Coordinating - Arizona	P	P	P	S	S	S	S	SD	N	S	S	S	N	N	N	P	N	S	N	N
Colorado	P	P	P	P	P	S	P	S	N	S	N	P	S	S	S	N	N	N	N	N
Massachusetts	P	P	P	P	-	P	P	P	S	S	S	P	P	P	S	S	S	S	SD	SD
Virginia	P	SD	P	SD	SD	P	P	SD	P	P	SD	P	P	P	SD	S	SD	SD	S	P

Key to abbreviations:
P.....board assumes primary role; plans, initiates, implements
S.....board assumes secondary role; approves, reviews (institutes plans, initiates, implements)
N.....board assumes no role; institutes plans, initiates, implements
SD.....shared

Appendix C_1

	New colleges-criteria/standards	Budget recommendations-gov/leg	Allocation/realloc-state funds	Establishment of new college	Evaluation of colleges	Program/facility master plan	Sole spokesman legislative matters	Institutional budgets	Articulation agreements	Federal project applications	Admission regulations	Tuition/fee charges	Tenure/promotion policies	Professional salary schedules	New service programs-comm services	New courses	Grading policies	Probation/suspension policies	Award of tenure/promotion	Award/terminate appointments
Washington	P	P	P	-	-	P	P	S	P	SD	P	-	SD	N	N	S	N	S	N	N
Coordinating - California	P	P	P	S	-	S	-	N	SD	N	-	-	-	N	P	S	P	P	N	N
Illinois	P	P	P	S	P	S	SD	S	P	S	S	S	N	N	S	S	N	N	N	N
Maryland	P	P	P	S	N	P	P	S	P	N	N	N	N	N	S	N	N	N	N	N
Mississippi	S	S	P	S	S	S	N	S	N	S	N	N	N	N	N	S	N	N	N	N
Wyoming	-	P	P	S	P	N	P	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

Key to abbreviations:
P.....board assumes primary role; plans, initiates, implements
S.....board assumes secondary role; approves, reviews (institutes plans, initiates, implements)
N.....board assumes no role; institutes plans, initiates, implements
SD.....shared

Appendix C_2

ACTIVITIES OF STATE LEVEL BOARDS

Boards Responsible for All Institutions of Higher Education

	new colleges-criteria/standards	Budget recommendations-gov/leg	Allocation/realloc-state funds	Establishment of new college	Evaluation of colleges	Program/facility master plan	Sole spokesman legislative matters	Institutional budgets	Articulation agreements	Federal project applications	Admission regulations	Tuition/fee charges	Tenure/promotion policies	Professional salary schedules	New service programs-comm services	New courses	Grading policies	Probation/suspension policies	Award of tenure/promotion	Award/terminate appointments
Governing - Georgia	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	S	P	S	S	P	S	-	S	S	S	S	S	S
Utah	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	S	P	S	S	P	P	N	S	S	S
West Virginia	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	S	S	P	P	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Coordinating - Arkansas	P	P	P	-	N	S	P	P	P	P	S	S	N	S	S	N	N	N	N	N
New Jersey	P	P	P	S	P	S	P	P	S	S	S	N	S	S	S	S	N	N	N	N
New Mexico	P	P	P	S	S	S	SD	P	N	N	N	S	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Ohio	P	P	P	P	N	P	SD	P	N	N	N	S	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

Key to abbreviations:
P.....board assumes primary role; plans, initiates, implements
S.....board assumes secondary role; approves, reviews (institutes plans, initiates, implements)
N.....board assumes no role; institutes plans, initiates, implements
SD.....shared

Appendix C_2

	New colleges-criteria/standards	Budget recommendations-gov/leg	Allocation/realloc-state funds	Establishment of new college	Evaluation of colleges	Program/facility master plan	Sole spokesman legislative matters	Institutional budgets	Articulation agreements	Federal project applications	Admission regulations	Tuition/fee charges	Tenure/promotion policies	Professional salary schedules	New service programs-comm services	New courses	Grading policies	Probation/suspension policies	Award of tenure/promotion	Award/terminate appointments
Oklahoma	P	P	P	S	P	S	P	P	S	S	P	S	N	N	S	S	S	S	N	N
South Carolina	P	P	P	S	N	P	-	P	P	N	N	S	N	N	S	S	N	N	N	N
Texas	P	SD	P	S	N	-	SD	SD	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	S	N	N	N	N
Wisconsin	P	P	-	P	SD	S	N	P	-	-	N	S	N	N	SD	N	N	N	N	N

Key to abbreviations:
P.....board assumes primary role; plans, initiates, implements
S.....board assumes secondary role; approves, reviews (institutes plans, initiates, implements)
N.....board assumes no role; institutes plans, initiates, implements
SD.....shared

Appendix C_3

ACTIVITIES OF STATE LEVEL BOARDS

Boards of State University Systems

	New colleges-criteria/standards	Budget recommendations-gov/leg	Allocation/realloc-state funds	Establishment of new college	Evaluation of colleges	Program/facility master plan	Sole spokesman legislative matters	Institutional budgets	Articulation agreements	Federal project applications	Admission regulations	Tuition/fee charges	Tenure/promotion policies	Professional salary schedules	New service programs-comm services	New courses	Grading policies	Probation/suspension policies	Award of tenure/promotion	Award/terminate appointments
Governing - Hawaii	P	P	P	P	S	S	S	S	-	S	-	P	S	P	S	S	N	N	S	S
Governing-Coordinating - Alaska	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Kentucky	-	P	P	-	P	-	-	P	-	-	-	-	P	-	N	N	-	-	P	P
Nevada	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	S	P	P	P	P	S	S	P	P	P	P
New York	P	P	P	P	P	S	P	S	N	S	S	S	N	N	S	S	N	N	N	N

Key to abbreviations:
P.....board assumes primary role; plans, initiates, implements
S.....board assumes secondary role; approves, reviews (institutes plans, initiates, implements)
N.....board assumes no role; institutes plans, initiates, implements
SD.....shared

Appendix C_4

ACTIVITIES OF STATE LEVEL BOARDS

Boards Responsible for All Public Educational Institutions

	New colleges-criteria/standards	Budget recommendations-gov/leg	Allocation/realloc-state funds	Establishment of new college	Evaluation of new college	Program/facility master plan	Sole spokesman legislative matters	Institutional budgets	Articulation agreements	Federal project applications	Admission regulations	Tuition/fee charges	Tenure/promotion policies	Professional salary schedules	New service programs-comm services	New courses	Grading policies	Probation/suspension policies	Award of tenure/promotion	Award/terminate appointments
Governing - Louisiana	P	P	P	P	P	-	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Tennessee	P	S	S	P	P	P	P	S	P	S	P	P	P	P	S	S	S	P	S	S
Governing-Coordinating - Alabama	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	N	S	P	P	P	P	N	N	P	P	P	S
Oregon	P	P	P	S	S	S	P	S	P	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Coordinating - Florida	P	P	P	S	P	S	P	S	P	S	N	S	P	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Idaho	P	S	S	P	P	P	SD	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Iowa	S	P	P	S	P	S	-	S	N	N	SD	SD	N	N	N	S	SD	N	N	N

Key to abbreviations:
P.....board assumes primary role; plans, initiates, implements
S.....board assumes secondary role; approves, reviews (institutes plans, initiates, implements)
N.....board assumes no role; institutes plans, initiates, implements
SD.....shared

Appendix C_4

	New colleges-criteria/standards	Budget recommendations-gov/leg	Allocation/realloc-state funds	Establishment of new college	Evaluation of colleges	Program/facility master plan	Sole spokesman legislative matters	Institutional budgets	Articulation agreements	Federal project applications	Admission regulations	Tuition/fee charges	Tenure/promotion policies	Professional salary schedules	New service programs-comm services	New courses	Grading policies	Probation/suspension policies	Award of tenure/promotion	Award/terminate appointments
Kansas	P	P	P	N	P	S	S	S	N	N	N	N	N	N	S	S	N	S	N	N
Michigan	P	N	P	S	S	P	N	N	S	S	N	-	N	N	S	S	N	N	N	N
Missouri	P	S	S	S	P	-	N	S	N	SD	SD	S	N	N	S	S	N	N	N	SD
Montana	-	N	-	N	P	N	N	N	N	N	S	S	N	N	S	S	N	N	N	N
North Carolina	P	P	P	S	P	P	-	S	S	S	P	P	N	S	N	S	N	N	N	N
Pennsylvania	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	S	N	S	S	N	N	N	S	N	N	N	N	N
Rhode Island	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Key to abbreviations:
P.....board assumes primary role; plans, initiates, implements
S.....board assumes secondary role; approves, reviews (institutes plans, initiates, implements)
N.....board assumes no role; institutes plans, initiates, implements
SD.....shared

Appendix D_1

ACTIVITIES OF STATE LEVEL BOARDS

Summary - All Governing Boards

	New colleges-criteria/standards	Budget recommendations-gov/leg	Allocation/realloc-state funds	Establishment of new college	Evaluation of colleges	Program/facility master plan	Sole spokesman legislative matters	Institutional budgets	Articulation agreements	Federal project applications	Admission regulations	Tuition/fee charges	Tenure/promotion policies	Professional salary schedules	New service programs-comm services	New courses	Grading policies	Probation/suspension policies	Award of tenure/promotion	Award/terminate appointments
Number of Boards Assuming Primary Responsibility	9	8	8	9	8	7	7	6	8	5	5	9	6	6	5	5	3	4	4	4
Number of Boards Assuming Secondary Responsibility	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	3	0	4	3	0	3	2	4	4	3	3	5	5
Number of Boards Assuming No Responsibility	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0
No Response	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Number of Boards Assuming Shared Responsibility	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Appendix D_2

ACTIVITIES OF STATE LEVEL BOARDS

Summary - All Governing-Coordinating Boards

	New colleges-criteria/standards	Budget recommendations-gov/leg	Allocation/realloc-state funds	Establishment of new colleges	Evaluation of colleges	Program/facility master plan	Sole spokesman legislative matters	Institutional budgets	Articulation agreements	Federal project applications	Admission regulations	Tuition/fee charges	Tenure/promotion policies	Professional salary schedules	New service programs-comm services	New courses	Grading policies	Probation/suspension policies	Award of tenure/promotion	Award/terminate appointments
Number of Boards Assuming Primary Responsibility	10	10	11	6	6	6	9	5	5	2	4	**6**	6	5	1	2	**3**	3	4	4
Number of Boards Assuming Secondary Responsibility	0	0	0	2	2	4	1	4	1	7	4	3	2	2	5	6	2	4	2	2
Number of Boards Assuming No Responsibility	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	2	3	4	3	4	2	4	4
No Response	1	0	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Number of Boards Assuming Shared Responsibility	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	2	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1

Appendix D_3

ACTIVITIES OF STATE LEVEL BOARDS

Summary - All Coordinating Boards

	New colleges-criteria/standards	Budget recommendations-gov/leg	Allocation/realloc-state funds	Establishment of new college	Evaluation of colleges	Program/facility master plan	Sole spokesman legislative matters	Institutional budgets	Articulation agreements	Federal project applications	Admission regulations	Tuition/fee charges	Tenure/promotion policies	Professional salary schedules	New service programs-comm services	New courses	Grading policies	Probation/suspension policies	Award of tenure/promotion	Award/terminate appointments
Number of Boards Assuming Primary Responsibility	18	16	18	4	12	7	7	8	5	1	2	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0
Number of Boards Assuming Secondary Responsibility	3	4	3	16	4	12	1	10	5	9	6	11	2	4	12	14	2	3	1	1
Number of Boards Assuming No Responsibility	0	2	0	2	5	2	6	4	10	10	11	7	18	18	8	8	18	18	21	20
No Response	2	0	2	1	1	2	4	0	2	2	2	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Number of Boards Assuming Shared Responsibility	0	1	0	0	1	0	5	1	1	1	2	1	0	o	1	0	1	0	0	1

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrahamson, Louise. State Planning for Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: The Academy for Educational Development, 1969.

Arney, Lawrence H. State Patterns of Financial Support for Community Colleges. Gainesville, Florida: Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, 1970.

Axelrod, Joseph, et al. Autonomy and Interdependence: Emerging Systems in Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1964.

Berdahl, Robert O. "The State Planning and Coordinating Agency for Higher Education." Paper prepared for the Sixteenth Annual Legislative Work Conference of the Southern Regional Education Board, August 27-29, 1967.

Berdahl, Robert O. A Study of Statewide Systems of Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1971.

Brouillet, Frank B. Coordination of Higher Education: An Overview with Emphasis on the State of Washington. Seattle: Center for the Development of Community College Education, University of Washington, 1968.

Browne, Arthur D. "The Institution and the System: Autonomy and Coordination," Long-Range Planning in Higher Education, Owen A. Knorr, ed. Boulder, Colorado: The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1964, pp. 39-51.

Brumbaugh, A. J. State-wide Planning and Coordination of Higher Education. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1963.

Bunnell, Kevin P. and Julia Vadala, eds. Effective State Board Leadership in Community College Development. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, February, 1969.

Chambers, M. M. Voluntary Statewide Coordination in Public Higher Education. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, 1961.

Clark, George W. A Study of Statewide Organizational Structures for Community Colleges. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Berkeley: University of California, 1966.

Cox, Lanier and Lester G. Harrell. The Impact of Federal Programs in Higher Education on State Planning and Coordination. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1969.

DeZonia, Robert H. "Coordination Among Higher Institutions in Wisconsin," Educational Record, 44:288-93, July, 1963.

Erickson, C. G. "Illinois Balances Statewide Planning and Local Autonomy," Junior College Journal, 38:22-26, March, 1968.

Eulau, Heinz, and Harold Quinley, State Officials and Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.

Glenny, Lyman A. "How Will Effective Institutional Articulation and Coordination Be Achieved at the Local, the State, the Region, and the National Level?" Current Issues in Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1957, pp. 156-61.

Glenny, Lyman A. "Politics and Current Patterns in Coordinating Higher Education," Campus and Capitol, W. John Minter, ed. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1966, pp. 27-46.

Glenny, Lyman A. "State Systems and Plans for Higher Education," Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education, Logan Wilson, ed. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1965, pp. 86-103.

Gove, Samuel K. Statewide Systems of Public Higher Education: An Analysis of Current Studies on the Topic. Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, 1967.

Green, Ralph T. "The Need for Coordination and Controls in the Financing of State Institutions," Proceedings of the 55th Annual Conference of the National Tax Association, 1962. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: National Tax Association, 1963, pp. 476-82.

Hall, Charles W. The Position and Function of the State Office Responsible for Public Community Junior College Education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1966.

Hall, C. W. "Status of the State Officer Responsible for Junior College Education," Junior College Journal, 38:32-34, March, 1968.

Halstead, D. Kent and Robert E. Jennings. State Comprehensive Planning for Higher Education: Current Practices. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education. Study underway.

Henry, D. D. "Institutional Cooperation and Coordination in Meeting New Responsibilities," North Central Association Quarterly, 32:318-24, April, 1958.

Holderman, Kenneth L. "State Coordination of 2-Year Colleges with Other Educational Institutions," State Directors of Junior Colleges and Coordinators of State Systems of 2-Year Colleges. Conference Proceedings, Chicago, Illinois, October 18-19, 1961. U. S. Office of Education. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1961, pp. 42-48.

Ingler, C. W. "Governing Principles for State Policy Toward Community Colleges," Educational Research Bulletin, 40:29-35, February, 1961.

Johnson, B. Lamar, ed. State Junior Colleges: How Can They Function Effectively? Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1965.

Lavender, Harold W. The New Mexico Board of Educational Finance: A Study in the Control of Higher Education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico, 1965.

Lombardi, John. "California's New State Board." Junior College Journal, 38:30, March, 1968.

Marsh, Robert Owen. Coordination of State Higher Education in Illinois: A Case Study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Normal, Illinois: Illinois State University, 1967.

Martorana, S. V., ed. Coordinating 2-Year Colleges in State Educational Systems. Washington, D. C.: Division of Higher Education, U. S. Office of Education, 1957.

Martorana, S. V. "Developments in Statewide Governance." Junior College Journal, 39:25-29, December, 1968 - January, 1969.

Martorana, S. V. and Ernest V. Hollis. State Boards Responsible for Higher Education. U. S. Office of Education. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1960.

Martorana, S. V. "State-Wide Coordination of Higher Education," Current Issues in Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1962, pp. 245-48.

Mayhew, Lewis B. Long Range Planning for Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: The Academy for Educational Development, 1969.

McConnell, T. R. "The Coordination of State Systems of Higher Education," Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education, Logan Wilson, ed. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1965, pp. 129-40.

McConnell, T. R. A General Pattern for American Public Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

McConnell, T. R. "The University and the State: A Comparative Study," Campus and Capitol, W. John Minter, ed. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1966, pp. 89-118.

McLure, M. P. "Our Junior Colleges: The Argument for a State System," Illinois Education, 51:243-44, February, 1963.

Medsker, Leland L. and George W. Clark. Statewide Governance of California Junior Colleges. Sacramento: California Coordinating Council for Higher Education, 1966.

Miller, James L., Jr. "The Two Dimensions of State-wide Higher Education Coordination," Educational Record, 43:163-67, April, 1962.

Millett, John D. "State Planning for Higher Education," Educational Record, 46:223-30, Summer, 1965.

Minter, W. John, ed. Campus and Capitol. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1966.

Moos, Malcolm and Frances E. Rourke. The Campus and the State. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1959.

Morphet, Edgar L. and David L. Jesser, ed. Emerging State Responsibilities for Education. Denver: Improving State Leadership in Education, 1970.

Palola, Ernest G. "Changing Centers of Power in Higher Education: A Challenge to Institutional Leadership." Paper prepared for the Junior College Presidents Seminar, June 21, 1968, Berkeley, California.

Palola, Ernest G. Statewide Planning in Higher Education: A Study of Planned Organizational Change. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California.

Paltridge, James G. California's Coordinating Council for Higher Education. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1968.

Paltridge, James G. Conflict and Coordination in Higher Education. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1968.

Paltridge, James G. Organizational Forms Which Characterize Statewide Coordination of Public Higher Education. Unpublished manuscript, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, 1965.

Pliner, E., ed. Coordination and Planning. Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Public Affairs Research Council, 1966.

Reitz, J. Wayne. "The Impact of State Systems on Institutional Autonomy." Paper presented to Sectional Meeting 14 at the 23rd National Conference on Higher Education, sponsored by the American Association for Higher Education, Chicago, March 4, 1968.

Roberts, Dayton Y., ed. Junior College Local and State Relations. Proceedings of the Junior College Conference, Ocean Springs, Mississippi, June 24-26, 1968. Gainesville, Florida: Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, 1968.

Russell, John Dale. Control and Coordination of Higher Education in Michigan. Staff Study Number 12 prepared for the Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education. Lansing: The Survey of Higher Education in Michigan, 1958.

Southern Regional Education Board. Effective Use of Resources in State Higher Education. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1970.

Stuckman, Jeffrey A. Coordination of Higher Education: An Annotated Bibliography. Gainesville: Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, 1969.

Stuckman, Jeffrey A. Practices and Institutional Effects of Function-Implementation by the Professional Staff of State-Wide Coordinating Agencies for Public Junior Colleges. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Gainesville: University of Florida, 1969.

Stuckman, Jeffrey A. Statewide Coordination of Community Junior Colleges. Gainesville, Florida: Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, 1969.

Usdan, Michael, David Minar and Emanual Hurwitz, Jr. The Evolving Relationships Between Higher Education Interests and Public School Interests in Selected States. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1969.

Ward, Charles F. An Analysis of Selected Legal and Operational Differences Among Public Two-Year College Systems. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University, 1969.

Wattenbarger, James L. "Changing Patterns of Junior College Control: Local to State Government," Junior College Journal, 33:9-16, May, 1968.

Wattenbarger, James L. "The Development of Community Colleges: Trends, Issues, Problems," Partnership for Progress, the report of a legislative work conference on Higher Education in the West, December 3-5, 1967, Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, Boulder, Colorado, pp. 45-51.

Wattenbarger, James L. and Luther Christofoli. State Level Coordination of Community Colleges: Academic Affairs. Gainesville, Florida: Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, 1971.

Wattenbarger, James L., William A. Gager, and Jeffrey A. Stuckman. The State Director for Community Junior Colleges. Gainesville, Florida: Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, 1969.

Wattenbarger, James L., William A. Gager, Jeffrey A. Stuckman and Melvyn Sakaguchi. State Level Staffs for Coordination and/or Control of Community Junior Colleges. Gainesville, Florida: Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, 1970.

White, Charles. Kentucky Council on Public Higher Education: Analysis of a Change in Structure. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1967.

Wilson, Logan. "State Coordination of Higher Education." Paper presented to the Association for Higher Education and the Washington Education Association, Seattle, Washington, December 2, 1966.